

Plaintiff,

MINUTES OF THE COURT

v.

WILLIAM MILLER, et al.,

Defendants.

June 9, 2015

PRESENT: THE	HONORABLE VALERIE	P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
DEPUTY CLERK:	LISA MANN	REPORTER: NONE APPEARING
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING		
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING		

## MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is defendants' motion to strike (#27) plaintiff's surreply (#26) to defendants' motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff opposed (#28).

The court may strike an improper filing under its "inherent power over the administration of its business." Spurlock v. F.B.I., 69 F.3d 1010, 1016 (9th Cir. 1995). In this District, briefing consists of a motion and opening brief, an opposition, and a reply. Local Rule 7-2. The nonmoving party—in this instance, plaintiff—may not respond to the moving party's reply without obtaining leave of the court. See id.

Defendants argue that plaintiff's surreply should be stricken because, under the Local Rules, it is an improper filing. (#27 at 2-3.) They point out that plaintiff failed to obtain leave prior to filing. (Id.) Plaintiff counters that he is uneducated in law and, therefore, the court cannot demand his compliance with the Local Rules. (#28 at 1.)

The motion to strike (#27) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's position is unpersuasive. The court reminds plaintiff that his status as a pro se party does not relieve him from his obligation to comply with procedural requirements. Instead, it merely lowers his burden with respect to

pleading, as compared to what the court might expect from an attorney. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010). Because plaintiff did not obtain leave, the court **STRIKES** his surreply (#26). Briefing on the summary judgment motion has concluded.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANC	CE S. WILSON, CLERK
By:	/s/
•	Deputy Clerk